

NATIVE POLICY IN AFRICA

OUR subject to-day will be African Native Policy. It bristles with difficult and contentious issues, and I must crave your attention to what may be a tedious discussion. If, owing to the short time at my disposal, I pass lightly over certain points, you must bear in mind that nevertheless I am fully aware of their importance. In our discussion of white settlement in Africa a good deal was said also on native policy, but only incidentally, as bearing on the subject of white settlement. But native policy deserves to be considered by itself, as it is far and away the most important issue which is raised by our European contact with the African continent and its peoples. The policy or policies which the European peoples are going to pursue towards the natives of Africa will have far-reaching effects, not only for Africa, but for the future of the world. This is the issue of the contact of colours and civilizations, which seems destined to become a dominant issue of the twentieth century. In Asia a similar question of the contact of colours and cultures is rapidly coming to the front, and history tells us what these impacts of Asia and Europe on each other have meant in the past. These impacts it was which, renewed at various epochs, set the peoples of Europe going, and launched them on that career which has led to their domination of the world. The influence of Europe to-day on

Asia seems to be having a somewhat similar rousing effect on a colossal scale. Under the stimulus of Western ideas, Asia is being stirred and shaken from one end to the other. The rise of Japan, the awakening of India, China, the Near East, and the Malayan islands of the Pacific seem to herald another of the great movements or upheavals of history. It will depend very much on the wisdom and far-sighted policies of the European peoples, and on the growth and the success of the League of Nations in its pacific world-policy, whether this awakening of the East will be for the good or the ill of the human race as a whole.

We are concerned to-day with these racial reactions in so far as they affect Europe and Africa—a smaller question, but still a very large human question, fraught with immense possibilities for the future of our own civilization as well as that of Africa. What is wanted in Africa to-day is a wise far-sighted native policy. If we could evolve and pursue a policy which will promote the cause of civilization in Africa without injustice to the African, without injury to what is typical and specific in the African, we shall render a great service to the cause of humanity. For there is much that is good in the African and which ought to be preserved and developed. The negro and the negroid Bantu form a distinct human type which the world would be poorer without. Here in this vast continent, with its wide geographical variety and its great climatic differences, this unique human type has been fixing itself for thousands of

years. It is even possible, so some anthropologists hold, that this was the original mother-type of the human race and that Africa holds the cradle of mankind. But whether this is so or not, at any rate here we have the vast result of time, which we should conserve and develop with the same high respect which we feel towards all great natural facts. This type has some wonderful characteristics. It has largely remained a child type, with a child psychology and outlook. A child-like human cannot be a bad human, for are we not in spiritual matters bidden to be like unto little children? Perhaps as a direct result of this temperament the African is the only happy human I have come across. No other race is so easily satisfied, so good-tempered, so care-free. If this had not been the case, it could scarcely have survived the intolerable evils which have weighed on it like a nightmare through the ages. A race, which could survive the immemorial practice of the witch doctor and the slave trader, and preserve its inherent simplicity and sweetness of disposition, must have some very fine moral qualities. The African easily forgets past troubles, and does not anticipate future troubles. This happy-go-lucky disposition is a great asset, but it has also its drawbacks. There is no inward incentive to improvement, there is no persistent effort in construction, and there is complete absorption in the present, its joys and sorrows. Wine, women, and song in their African forms remain the great consolations of life. No indigenous religion has been evolved, no literature, no art since the magnifi-

cent promise of the cave-men and the South African petroglyphist, no architecture since Zimbabwe (if that is African). Enough for the Africans the simple joys of village life, the dance, the tom-tom, the continual excitement of forms of fighting which cause little bloodshed. They can stand any amount of physical hardship and suffering, but when deprived of these simple enjoyments, they droop, sicken, and die. Travellers tell how for weeks the slaves would move impassively in captive gangs; but when they passed a village and heard the pleasant noises of children, the song and the dance, they would suddenly collapse and die, as if of a broken heart. These children of nature have not the inner toughness and persistence of the European, nor those social and moral incentives to progress which have built up European civilization in a comparatively short period. But they have a temperament which suits mother Africa, and which brings out the simple joys of life and deadens its pain, such as no other race possesses.

It is clear that a race so unique, and so different in its mentality and its cultures from those of Europe, requires a policy very unlike that which would suit Europeans. Nothing could be worse for Africa than the application of a policy, the object or tendency of which would be to destroy the basis of this African type, to de-Africanize the African and turn him either into a beast of the field or into a pseudo-European. And yet in the past we have tried both alternatives in our dealings with the Africans. First

we looked upon the African as essentially inferior or sub-human, as having no soul, and as being only fit to be a slave. As a slave he became an article of commerce, and the greatest article of export from this continent for centuries. But the horrors of this trade became such that the modern conscience finally revolted and stamped out African slavery—peacefully in the British Empire, but in America with the convulsions of civil war and a million dead. Then we changed to the opposite extreme. The African now became a man and a brother. Religion and politics combined to shape this new African policy. The principles of the French Revolution which had emancipated Europe were applied to Africa; liberty, equality, and fraternity could turn bad Africans into good Europeans. The political system of the natives was ruthlessly destroyed in order to incorporate them as equals into the white system. The African was good as a potential European; his social and political culture was bad, barbarous, and only deserving to be stamped out root and branch. In some of the British possessions in Africa the native just emerging from barbarism was accepted as an equal citizen with full political rights along with the whites. But his native institutions were ruthlessly proscribed and destroyed. The principle of equal rights was applied in its crudest form, and while it gave the native a semblance of equality with whites, which was little good to him, it destroyed the basis of his African system which was his highest good. These are the two extreme native policies which have prevailed in

the past, and the second has been only less harmful than the first. If Africa has to be redeemed, if Africa has to make her own contribution to the world, if Africa is to take her rightful place among the continents, we shall have to proceed on different lines and evolve a policy which will not force her institutions into an alien European mould, but which will preserve her unity with her own past, conserve what is precious in her past, and build her future progress and civilization on specifically African foundations. That should be the new policy, and such a policy would be in line with the traditions of the British Empire. As I said on an occasion which has become historic: the British Empire does not stand for assimilation of its peoples into a common type, it does not stand for standardization, but for the fullest freest development of its peoples along their own specific lines. This principle applies not only to its European, but also to its Asiatic and its African constituents.

It is a significant fact that this new orientation of African policy had its origin in South Africa, and that its author was Cecil Rhodes in his celebrated Glen Grey Act. Rhodes's African policy embodied two main ideas: white settlement to supply the steel framework and the stimulus for an enduring civilization, and indigenous native institutions to express the specifically African character of the natives in their future development and civilization. African policies should arise in Africa, from the experience of the men and women who are in daily contact with its living problems. And it is therefore significant that

the lines on which the new Africa is being shaped are mainly of African origin. When I call Rhodes the original author of the new policy I do not mean that it was his sole, individual inspiration. During the most fruitful and successful period of his public life he was associated with Jan Hofmeyr, who was one of the wisest, most experienced, and far-sighted men whom South Africa has ever produced. In evolving his native policy Rhodes collaborated closely and continuously with Hofmeyr; and the policy in the form it took in the celebrated Glen Grey Act was therefore the joint product of Rhodes and Hofmeyr, of English- and Dutch-speaking South Africans. The new orientation therefore rests on a very broad basis of African experience.

Prior to the Glen Grey legislation it had been the practice in South Africa, as it had been the practice in all European-occupied territory in Africa, to rule the natives direct through government officials, —direct rule, as it has been called. Even where natives were left undisturbed in the possession of their tribal lands, the native organs of self-government were broken down and government rule was constituted in their place. The native chiefs were either deposed and deprived of authority, or where use was made of them they were incorporated into the official system and appointed as officers of the Government, from whom they derived all their authority and in whose name that authority was exercised. The principal innovation of Rhodes in his new legislation was, so far as possible, to introduce indirect white

rule, and to make the natives manage their local tribal affairs. A system of native councils was inaugurated for the smaller areas, from which again delegates met to form a larger general council under the chairmanship of the resident magistrate of the area. Powers of taxation, of administration, and of recommending legislation to the Government were conferred on these councils. His second innovation was to make it possible for natives in their tribal areas to become possessed of their own separate plots of agricultural land, instead of the traditional communal holding and working of land which is the universal native system throughout Africa. Under the native system the tribe, not the individual, owns the lands, and from time to time the chief and his advisers assign to each head of a family the plot which he may cultivate for himself. This plot can be and is usually changed, so that there is no fixity of tenure, and in consequence no incentive to improve the land and to do the best with it or get the most out of it. For this communal social system of land tenure Rhodes substituted individual tenure, under certain reservations and with certain safeguards designed in the interests of the native holders themselves. A third feature of his system was a labour tax of ten shillings per annum, imposed on all native heads of families who did not go out to work beyond their district for three months in the year. The object of this tax was obvious. The whites wanted labourers, and the natives were supposed to require some inducement to go and work instead of sitting on their

holdings and seeing their women work. Both in the interests of the whites and the natives, therefore, this special tax was imposed as an economic experiment. The tax, however, was unpopular with the natives from the start, and soon appeared to be an unnecessary irritation. The native men went to work quite readily or sent their young men to work for the whites. Before many years this special tax was repealed, and in later years a similar tax in the Transvaal met with the same fate. The native, although a slow worker, is not lazy, and does not require any special inducement to play his part in the economic development of the country. His main incentive is the rising scale of his needs in food and clothing, both for himself and for his often large family of children. In addition he is handicapped in South Africa by want of sufficient land for his requirements, and by the non-economic character of native farming on the whole. With his rise in the scale of civilization his needs rapidly develop, and he soon finds it necessary to supplement the scanty proceeds of his farming with the ready cash which he can earn in white employment. His economic lot, therefore, inevitably becomes more difficult, and forms a sufficient incentive to go out and work without any special means taken to force him to do so. The universal experience in Africa is that, although it takes some time at the beginning for the native to enter white employment, his rapidly growing economic needs in a white environment, and with a rising scale of living, soon make him take his full share of the burden without any

necessity to resort to special measures. The young European communities who in other parts of the African continent are struggling with this labour question as their principal trouble, and who may feel tempted to resort to the unsuccessful experiments which we have tried and discarded in South Africa, may take heart from our experience in South Africa of the native as a continuously improving worker. Dismissing therefore the question of a labour tax, we come to consider the other features of Rhodes's Act, their general bearing on African native policy.

His provision of individual agricultural holdings has been a great success, and has been a principal means of native advance where it has been adopted in the Union. The native system of land socialism is not only primitive but most wasteful in its working. Why should the native farmer improve and render productive what belongs to the community, and may be taken away from him by the community? The result is that these communal farm lands rapidly deteriorate and become exhausted, and have to be abandoned after a few years' use. Then the farm lands shift to another area of the tribal domain where the same process of uneconomic exhaustion is repeated. And in the course of years this shifting cultivation works havoc with the natural resources of the domain; the soil is progressively exhausted; the forests and trees disappear; the natural vegetable covering is destroyed; soil erosion sets in; the rainfall is lessened, and what water does fall flows off in torrents; arid conditions arise; and the tribal lands

become a barren waste. This sad phenomenon can be seen in one degree or another all over the African continent. Not only in South Africa, but in many other parts of the continent a native area or reserve can be recognized at a distance by the obvious general deterioration of the natural vegetation and the soil. But for the enormous natural resources and recuperative power of the continent, most of Africa would by now be a howling wilderness, because of the wasteful rural economy of its population. Unless the carrying capacity of the land is to be gravely impaired in the future, steps will have to be taken everywhere to preserve the forests and the soil, and to teach the native better methods of agriculture. Practical agricultural education must indeed become one of the principal subjects of native education. But nothing will have a more far-reaching effect than a general system of individual agricultural holdings under proper safeguards. The economic incentive to use properly, and to improve, what is one's own, is more powerful than any other factor of progress. In a world tending more and more towards general socialism, the vague phrase of 'native socialism' may sound attractive, but its practical effects in Africa are everywhere devastating, and it has significantly maintained on that continent the most backward conditions to be found anywhere.

The main object of the Glen Grey legislation was, however, to give the native his own institutions for his self-development and self-government. It marks definitely the abandonment of the older policy of

direct rule, according to which the white man's system and culture had to be imposed on the native, and native institutions had to be scrapped as barbarous. The new policy is to foster an indigenous native culture or system of cultures, and to cease to force the African into alien European moulds. As a practical policy of native government it has worked most successfully. Gradually the system of native councils and native self-government through their own tribal chiefs and elected councils has been extended from one native area to another in the Cape Province, until to-day about two-thirds of the Cape natives, or roughly over a million, fall under this system and manage their own local affairs according to their own ideas under the supervision of the European magistrates. They impose a small capitation tax of ten shillings per annum for their own local requirements, they look after their own roads, and the dipping of their cattle against disease; they teach improved agricultural methods through their own native officers; they amend their customary native law, advise the Government in regard to proposed laws in their areas, and in many other ways they look after their own local interests, find useful expression for their political energies, and get an invaluable training in disinterested public service. A sense of pride in their institutions and their own administration is rapidly developing, and, along with valuable experience in administration and public affairs, they are also acquiring a due sense of responsibility; where mistakes are made they feel satis-

fied that they have only themselves to blame. After the new system had worked successfully and with ever increasing efficiency for twenty-five years, I thought the time ripe in 1920 to extend it to the whole of the Union, and in that year an Act was passed which gave increased powers to the councils and authorized the Government to introduce them over the whole Union, wherever the advance of the natives might justify the step. A Native Affairs Commission was at the same time appointed to advise the natives and the Government in regard to the establishment of new Councils, as well as in reference to all legislation affecting the natives. And it is confidently expected that before many years have passed the greater portion of the native population of South Africa will be in charge of their own local affairs, under general white supervision; and in this way they will get an outlet for their political and administrative energies and ambitions which will give them the necessary training for eventual participation in a wider sphere of public life.

The new departure is most far-reaching and has come none too soon. Already the African system is disintegrating everywhere over the whole African continent. Many factors have combined to produce this situation. Missionaries share the blame with governments, the fight against the native social ideas has been no less destructive than the deposition of native chiefs and the institution of European organs of government. Unfortunately the earlier efforts of missionary enterprise were made without

any reference to, or knowledge of, the peculiar native psychology, or the light which anthropology has thrown on the past of human cultures. For the natives, religion, law, natural science, social customs and institutions, all form one blended whole, which enshrines their view of the world and of the forces governing it. Attack this complex system at any single point, and the whole is endangered. The introduction of the Christian religion meant not only the breakdown of the primitive belief in spirits, in magic and witchcraft, and the abandonment of the practice of polygamy; it meant the breakdown of the entire integral native *Weltanschauung* or outlook on life and the world. A knowledge of anthropology would have been most useful, and would have helped to conserve the native social system, while ridding it of what was barbarous or degrading. The tendency of the Christian mission has therefore on the whole been to hasten the disintegration of the native system, both in its good and its bad aspects. To this has been added the introduction of the white man's administration through his own official organs, the breakdown of the authority of the chiefs and the tribal system, and the loosening of the bonds which bind native society together, with the consequent weakening or disappearance of tribal discipline over the young men and women of the tribe. The general disintegration has been powerfully reinforced by the vast improvement in the means of transport, the opening of communications, and by labour recruitment, which have led to the movement of natives

and their mix-up on a scale which would have been impossible before. The events of the Great War on the African continent have also contributed to this general disintegration. If the bonds of native tribal cohesion and authority are dissolved, the African governments will everywhere sit with vast hordes of detribalized natives on their hands, for whom the traditional restraints and the discipline of the chiefs and the elders will have no force or effect. The old social and religious sanctions will have disappeared, while no new sanctions except those of the white man's laws will have been substituted. Such a situation would be unprecedented in the history of the world and the results may well be general chaos. From time immemorial the natives of Africa have been subject to a stern, even a ruthless, discipline, and their social system has rested on the despotic authority of their chiefs. If this system breaks down and tribal discipline disappears, native society will be resolved into its human atoms, with possibilities of universal Bolshevism and chaos which no friend of the natives, or the orderly civilization of this continent, could contemplate with equanimity. Freed from all traditional moral and social discipline, the native, just emerging from barbarism, may throw all restraint to the winds. Such a breakdown should be prevented at all costs, and everything should be done to maintain in the future the authority which has guided native life in the past. In the interests of the native as well as those of the European administrations responsible for their welfare, we are called

upon to retrace our steps, to take all proper measures which are still possible to restore or preserve the authority of the chiefs, and to maintain the bonds of solidarity and discipline which have supported the tribal organization of the natives in the past. This authority or discipline need not be exercised in a barbarous way, and should be shorn of all old-time cruelty and other undesirable features. But in essence it should be maintained, and under the general supervision and check of the European magistrate it should continue to be exercised. Special means should be taken to instruct chiefs in their duties, and the sons of chiefs and headmen should be trained to the proper exercise of the leadership which they may be called upon to fill. Such schools already exist, not only in South Africa, but under the Tanganyika and Uganda administrations, and may prove most helpful in preserving the traditional native chieftainship and headmanship as a vital link in the organization of native society.

The new policy is in effect enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations and in the mandates passed thereunder. Act 22 of the Covenant lays down that in those colonies and territories taken from the defeated Powers, which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there shall be applied the principle, that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization, and that this trust shall be carried out by advanced nations acting as mandatories on behalf of the League

of Nations. The development of peoples, not yet able to stand by themselves, can only mean the progress and civilization of these backward peoples in accordance with their own institutions, customs, and ideas, in so far as these are not incompatible with the ideals of civilization. That this was the plain meaning and intention of the article I can state with some authority, as I was in a measure responsible for this mandate principle and for its formulation in article 22 of the Covenant. This article enshrines a policy and a principle which is not only in consonance with common sense, but which has already been tested in practice on a fairly large scale, and which in future ought to govern universally the contacts between European and other less advanced peoples.

It may be of some interest to indicate briefly how this policy is being applied in a mandated territory like Tanganyika. The foundation of the system is the maintenance and building up of the authority of the chiefs in their various ranks. Their sons receive special training in a school for the sons of chiefs, intended to fit them for their future duties. Their office is hereditary, but deposition and popular election are both possible in accordance with native ideas. The chief is responsible for the administration of his tribe, maintains order and good government within its area, and prevents the commission of offences. The heads of families pay an annual tax of ten shillings, which goes into the tribal treasury, from which a fixed amount is paid to the chief for his maintenance, the balance being devoted to tribal pur-

poses. The chief can issue orders for a large number of purposes, such as prohibiting or controlling the manufacture and consumption of intoxicating liquors, preventing the pollution of the water in any stream, controlling migration of natives to or from his area, and requiring any native to cultivate land in such a way and with such crops as will secure a proper supply of food for him and his family. He may also make rules imposing fines and other penalties for the enforcement of his orders. Native courts are also instituted, administering native law and custom in both civil and criminal cases between natives within a certain jurisdiction; and from their decisions or sentences appeals lie ultimately to a white authority, who has also to confirm certain criminal sentences before their execution.

The white administration remains responsible for the larger functions of government, such as the combating of human and animal diseases, the organization of education, the improvement of agriculture, and the construction of public works, and maintains a staff for these and similar purposes. But all the purely tribal concerns are left to the chief and his counsellors whose actions are supervised by the white officer only in certain cases intended to prevent abuses. The native system may not be as efficient and incorruptible as direct white rule would be, but a certain amount of inefficiency or even injustice, according to white ideas, is excusable, so long as the natives are trained to govern themselves according to their own ideas, and bear the responsibility for their own small mis-

takes. In this way they learn to stand by themselves, and will in the long run be trained to do all their own local government work. It is not only the training in self-government that will benefit them. They will develop the sense of responsibility which goes with it, and which is in itself one of the most valuable lessons of life. In looking after their own concerns they will, in addition, cultivate a sense of pride in their own system and increase their self-respect. And, above all, they will develop an active interest in their own public affairs, which will be of enormous moral and social value. The white man does the native a grave injury by doing everything for him in the way of government, and thereby depriving his life of all public interest. Gone is the excitement of his petty wars; and if in addition there is the repression of all his former public activities and the suppression of his native values, we must expect a sense of frustration which will take all the zest out of his life. The question has even been raised whether the white man's rule, in taking all the interest out of native life, is not responsible for that decadence, lowered birth-rate, and slow petering out which we see in the case of many primitive peoples. At any rate the new policy of native self-government will provide the natives with plenty of bones to chew at and plenty of matter to wrangle over—and they do love to talk and dispute *ad infinitum*—and in that way help to fill their otherwise empty lives with interest.

Another important consequence will follow from this system of native institutions. Wherever Euro-

peans and natives live in the same country, it will mean separate parallel institutions for the two. The old practice mixed up black with white in the same institutions; and nothing else was possible, after the native institutions and traditions had been carelessly or deliberately destroyed. But in the new plan there will be what is called in South Africa 'segregation'—separate institutions for the two elements of the population, living in their own separate areas. Separate institutions involve territorial segregation of the white and black. If they live mixed up together it is not practicable to sort them out under separate institutions of their own. Institutional segregation carries with it territorial segregation. The new policy therefore gives the native his own traditional institutions on land which is set aside for his exclusive occupation. For agricultural and pastoral natives, living their tribal life, large areas or reserves are set aside, adequate for their present and future needs. In not setting aside sufficient such areas in South Africa in the past we committed a grievous mistake, which is at the root of most of our difficulties in native policy. For urbanized natives, on the other hand, who live, not under tribal conditions but as domestic servants or industrial workers in white areas, there are set aside native villages or locations, adjoining to the European towns. In both rural reserves and town locations the natives take a part in or run their own local self-government. Such is the practice now in vogue in South Africa and it is likely to develop still further, and to

spread all over Africa where white and black live and work together in the same countries. For residential and local government purposes a clean cleavage is becoming ever more marked, the white portion of the population living under more advanced European institutions, while the natives next door maintain their simpler indigenous system. This separation is imperative, not only in the interests of a native culture, and to prevent native traditions and institutions from being swamped by the more powerful organization of the whites, but also for other important purposes, such as public health, racial purity, and public good order. The mixing up of two such alien elements as white and black leads to unhappy social results—racial miscegenation, moral deterioration of both, racial antipathy and clashes, and to many other forms of social evil. In these great matters of race, colour, and culture, residential separation and parallel institutions alone can do justice to the ideals of both sections of the population. The system is accepted and welcomed by the vast majority of natives; but it is resented by a small educated minority who claim 'equal rights' with the whites. It is, however, evident that the proper place of the educated minority of the natives is with the rest of their people, of whom they are the natural leaders, and from whom they should not in any way be dissociated.

Far more difficult questions arise on the industrial plane. It is not practicable to separate black and white in industry, and their working together in the

same industry and in the same works leads to a certain amount of competition and friction and antagonism, for which no solution has yet been found. Unhappy attempts have been made in South Africa to introduce a colour bar, and an Act of that nature is actually on the Statute book, but happily no attempt has yet been made to apply it in practice. It empowers the Government to set aside separate spheres of work for the native and the non-native, the object being to confine the native to the more or less unskilled occupations or grades of work. The inherent economic difficulties of such a distribution of industrial functions, the universal objection of the native workers, and the sense of fair-play among the whites will make its practical application virtually impossible. No statutory barrier of that kind should be placed on the native who wishes to raise himself in the scale of civilization, nor could it be maintained for long against the weight of modern public opinion. As a worker the white man should be able to hold his own in competition with the native. Industrial as distinguished from territorial segregation would be both impracticable and an offence against the modern conscience.

There remains the big question how far the parallelism of native and white institutions is to go? Is it to be confined to local government, or is it to go all the way, up to the level of full political or parliamentary government? Should black and white cooperate in the same parliamentary institutions of the country? If so, should they have separate representa-

tives in the same parliamentary institutions? Few acquainted with the facts and the difficulties can profess to see clear daylight in the tangle of this problem. In the older practice, embodied in the constitution of the former Cape Colony and in many other colonial institutions, political equality between the different races on the basis of a complete mixture of political rights was recognized. Justice is colour-blind and recognizes no political differences on grounds of colour or race. Hence the formula of equal 'rights for all civilized men' with which the name of Rhodes is identified, and which represents the traditional British policy. That policy, however, arose at a time when the doctrine of native parallelism had not yet emerged, when native institutions were proscribed as barbarous, and the only place for the civilized native was therefore in the white man's system and the white man's institutions. The question is whether the new principle makes, or should make, any difference to the old tradition of mixed and equal political rights in the same parliamentary institutions. I notice that the Hilton Young Commission, after having made a powerful plea for separate native institutions for local government purposes, pause when they come up against the question of parliamentary institutions, and in the end leave the question over for the future.

'If' (they say), 'the idea of parallel development is accepted, then it follows that it is desirable to keep the way open as long as possible for the maximum measure of political segregation. This suggests that political development for the native and

the settled areas should be carried forward on separate lines—native and British respectively—as far as possible.’¹

Lord Lugard, in dealing with the question of equal rights in relation to colour, lays down the following proposition which a former President of the United States of America approved of:

‘Here, then,’ (he says), ‘is the true conception of the inter-relation of colour: complete uniformity in ideals, absolute equality in the paths of knowledge and culture, equal opportunity for those who strive, equal administration for those who achieve; in matters social and racial a separate path, each pursuing his own inherited traditions, preserving his own race-purity and race-pride; equality in things spiritual, agreed difference in the physical and material.’²

An admirable statement of the principle to which I think all fair-minded men will agree. But you notice once more the silence about political rights.

I do not think there can be, or that at bottom there is, among those who have given the subject serious attention, any doubt that in the supreme legislature of a country with a mixed population all classes and colours should have representation. It is repugnant to our civilized European ideas that the weaker in a community should not be heard or should go without representation, either by themselves or through European spokesmen, where their interests are concerned. There can be but one sovereign body in a country, and that body should represent the weaker no less than the stronger. To that extent there should be agreement. As to the mode of representa-

¹ Cmd. 3234, p. 84.

² *Dual Mandate*, p. 87

tion of colour in the supreme parliament there can be legitimate difference of opinion. The older practice was to give equal rights in the sense of mixed representation, the same member of the legislature representing mixed bodies of white and native voters alike. The new policy of segregation of political rights would seem to point to separate representation for the colours in the same parliament so that white and native voters would vote in separate constituencies for separate representatives. There would still be equal political rights, and the Rhodes ideal in that sense would not be affected, but they would be exercised separately or communally. In South Africa, which, owing to the advanced condition of its natives, has become a sort of cockpit for race issues, we started with the older system of mixed constituencies in the Cape Colony, and this system is embodied and entrenched in the Act of Union which forms our Constitution. The present Government have proposed to scrap this system for the future, and to give separate representation in Parliament to native and non-native voters. A policy which might have been easy and, from certain points of view, even commendable, with a clean slate before us, has become enormously difficult because of what has been done in the past, and the justifiable fervour with which the Cape natives cling to their vested rights, which they have enjoyed for three-quarters of a century. A battle royal is still proceeding on this and cognate issues affecting the political rights of the natives, and it will require all the wisdom and patience which we can

command in South Africa if we are to reach a generally acceptable solution. If we had to do only with the tribal native voters the question would not be so difficult, and the application of the general segregation principle to the particular case of political rights might be justified. Unfortunately very large numbers of detribalized natives are spread all over the Cape, and are no longer resident or registered in the native areas. These urbanized natives living among the whites constitute the real crux, and it is a difficulty which goes far beyond the political issue. They raise a problem for the whole principle of segregation, as they claim to be civilized and Europeanized, and do not wish to be thrust back into the seclusion of their former tribal associations, or to forgo their new place in the sun among the whites. With the application of strict education and civilization tests it would probably be the better course to allow them to exercise their political rights along with the whites. Were it not for this case of the urbanized or detribalized natives, the colour problem, not only in South Africa but elsewhere in Africa, would be shorn of most of its difficulties. And the situation in South Africa is therefore a lesson to all the younger British communities farther north to prevent as much as possible the detachment of the native from his tribal connexion, and to enforce from the very start the system of segregation with its conservation of separate native institutions.

In conclusion I wish to refer to an apparent discrepancy between this lecture and my previous one.

In that lecture I stressed the importance of white settlement in Africa as a potent means of furthering native progress and civilization. I pointed out that enduring contact with the white man's civilization is the surest way to civilize the native. In this lecture I have emphasized the importance of preserving native institutions, of keeping intact as far as possible the native system of organization and social discipline. It may be thought that there is a clash between these two aims, and that civilization by white contact must inevitably lead to the undermining and ultimately to the destruction of the native culture and social system. This, however, is not so. So long as there is territorial segregation, so long as the native family home is not with the white man but in his own area, so long the native organization will not be materially affected. While the native may come voluntarily out of his own area for a limited period every year to work with a white employer, he will leave his wife and children behind in their native home. The family life in the native home will continue on the traditional lines; the routine of the family and of the tribe will not be altered in any material respect. The male adults, father and sons, will no doubt imbibe new ideas in their white employment, but their social system will not suffer on that account. It is only when segregation breaks down, when the whole family migrates from the tribal home and out of the tribal jurisdiction to the white man's farm or the white man's town, that the tribal bond is snapped, and the traditional system falls into decay. And it is this migration of

the native family, of the females and children, to the farms and the towns which should be prevented. As soon as this migration is permitted the process commences which ends in the urbanized detribalized native and the disappearance of the native organization. It is not white employment of the native males that works the mischief, but the abandonment of the native tribal home by the women and children. This the law should vigorously prevent, and the system—whether it is administered through passes or in any other way—should only allow the residence of males for limited periods, and for purposes of employment among the whites. If this is done there will be no serious danger that the indigenous native system will be unduly affected.

At the same time I wish to point out that the prevention of this migration will be no easy task, even where ample tribal lands are guaranteed to the natives. The whites like to have the families of their native servants with them. It means more continuous and less broken periods of labour, and it means more satisfied labourers. It means, moreover, the use of the women and children for such work as they are fit for. These are considerable advantages, and the white employers will not be very keen to carry out a law against them. On the other hand, the native also very often likes to get away from the jurisdiction of the chief and the discipline of the tribe, and prefers to have his women and his children around him in his daily life. For the native the pressure to break away from the old bonds and live with his white master is thus very

great. We have seen the process at work in South Africa. When the white emigrants entered and occupied Natal, they found the entire territory between Zululand and Pondoland unoccupied; it had been laid bare and made a waste buffer between these two powerful native states. But no sooner had the whites settled in this empty area, than native deserters, dissatisfied with the harsh rule of their chiefs, began to arrive and to settle as servants among the whites. And to-day, through this wholly voluntary migration, the province of Natal has a very large native population. It was not a case of the natives not having sufficient fertile lands for their own use. Zululand is one of the most fertile parts of South Africa, and it was and remains comparatively thinly populated. White employment, white protection, the freedom of the white man's rule compared to the discipline of the native chief and the jurisdiction of the tribe have been the potent factors in bringing about this migration. And they will continue to operate in all parts of Africa where whites settle down. In the old Cape Colony one frontier after another was drawn by the Cape governors between the white settlements and the native tribes, and migration from the one to the other was prohibited under stern penalties. But the system was for ever breaking down. The whites like to have native servants; the natives prefer to have white masters, and this double economic attraction has proved too much for any prohibitory law.

There is, however, no reason why segregation, although it has broken down in South Africa in the

past, should not be a workable and enforceable system in the future. The power of Government and the reach of the law are to-day very different from what they were under the primitive nomadic conditions of the old Cape frontier. The system of native administration is to-day so ramified and pervasive, the policeman is so ubiquitous, that segregation can be tried under far more favourable conditions than existed in South Africa in the past. The young countries to the north can start with a clean slate. They can learn from the mistakes which we made in South Africa, and can *ab initio* reserve ample lands for the natives to live and work on. They can check the abuses of the chiefs, and can effectively supervise the working of the native system, both in its administrative and judicial aspects. Witchcraft can be fought, official injustice and corruption can be largely prevented, schools can be established, and the simplest amenities of civilized life can be introduced, in the native villages and tribal areas. The position is really very different from what it was generations ago, and the inducements for native families to remain on their tribal lands are such, or can be made such, that a segregation law will become comparatively easy to carry out. The women and children will continue to carry on their native life at home, will continue to work in the homes and in the fields as they have done from the immemorial past. The men, instead of lying in the sun, or brawling over their beer, or indulging in the dangerous sport of tribal warfare, will go out to work, and supplement the family income and

render tolerable a weight which under the new conditions is becoming more and more difficult for the women and children. They should never be away long, and the physical and moral life of the family and the tribe need not suffer because of the short periods of absence. Theorists may pick holes in such a system, but there is no practical reason why it should not work in practice. There is no break in the communal village life, but among the men the thin end of the industrial wedge is quietly introduced, and they rightly become the bread-winners which they have seldom or never been. Such a system has great redeeming features, and compares more than favourably with the old ways, which meant absolute stagnation for the men, and virtual slavery for the women. It represents a compromise between the native routine of the past and the white man's industrial system, which may work tolerably well in the future. Without breaking down what is good in the native system, it will graft on to it a wholesome economic development, which will yet not disturb too deeply the traditional ways of mother Africa. The white man's civilization and the steadily progressing native culture will live side by side and react on each other, and the problems of their contact will provide a fruitful theme for the statesmen of the future.